

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and have not been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (US 2003/0039244). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner seems to be equating the Owens's DSL modem/gateway 104 with the Applicant's claimed Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer (DSLAM). These are two entirely different things. Note Owens FIG. 2, which illustrates the DSL modem 104 and includes an arrow in the upper right-hand corner labeled, "To DSLAM".

The DSL modem in Owens has a number of functionalities relating to authentication of the user device and automatic configuration of the DSL modem. Owens's main objective is to automate the configuration of the DSL modem and eliminate manual configuration tasks previously performed by the end user. Owens still has a conventional DSLAM in the process as well as a conventional Broadband Remote Access Server (BRAS) for configuring the service bindings.

The Applicant's invention solves a different problem. The Applicant's invention modifies the DSLAM in such a way that the BRAS is no longer needed for configuration of the service bindings. This eliminates several problems with the BRAS-based service binding procedure, which Owens does not solve or even address. The DSL modem in Owens is more closely related to the bridging network terminal (NT) 32 in the Applicant's configuration (see FIG. 4). After dynamically configuring the service bindings, the Applicant's DSLAM trains the NT to utilize an identified PVC on a local DSL loop associated with the end user requesting a service.

Owens does not disclose or suggest a DSLAM that eliminates the need for a BRAS for configuration of the service bindings, as claimed by the Applicant. Therefore,

the withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and the allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 10 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus-type claim 1. Claim 10 recites steps that eliminate the need for a BRAS for configuration of the service bindings. Such a method is not taught or suggested by Owens, which concentrates on the DSL modem. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and the allowance of claim 10 are respectfully requested.

Claim 13 depends from claim 10 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 10. Therefore, the allowance of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens in view of Holmgren et al. (US 7,277,442). The Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is also distinguishable over Owens and Holmgren for the reasons discussed above.

As noted above, Owens concentrates on the DSL modem 104, and fails to disclose or suggest a DSLAM or method that eliminates the need for a BRAS for configuration of the service bindings. Holmgren is cited for showing that a requested service is accessed through an S-VLAN, and for showing that Ethernet includes means for mapping the S-VLAN to the address for the end user device. Like Owens, however, Holmgren also fails to disclose or suggest a DSLAM or method that achieves the result of the Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, Holmgren does not overcome the shortcomings of Owens, and the combination of Owens and Holmgren still does not disclose or suggest the DSLAM as claimed.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2 and 3 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 5 recites among other features, that the claimed DSLAM includes:

...
a RADIUS client that sends login credentials and a service request from the identified end-user device to an external RADIUS server for authentication and receives from the external RADIUS server, a plurality of attributes for configuring the Ethernet DSLAM to provide a service binding corresponding to the requested service,
...

Thus, the claimed DSLAM eliminates the need for a BRAS for configuration of the service bindings. This feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Owens and Holmgren. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of claim 5 are respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 5 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 5. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6-9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 10. Therefore, the allowance of claims 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 14 recites among other steps:

...
receiving from the external RADIUS server, a plurality of attributes for a service binding corresponding to the requested service, said attributes including an identification of a Service Virtual Local Area Network (S-VLAN) through which the requested service is accessed, and an identification of a Permanent Virtual Circuit (PVC) on a local DSL loop associated with the end-user device;
configuring the Ethernet DSLAM to provide the service binding corresponding to the requested service; and
...

Thus, in the claimed method, the DSLAM eliminates the need for a BRAS for configuration of the service bindings. This feature is not taught or suggested by the combination of Owens and Holmgren. Therefore, the withdrawal of the § 103 rejection and the allowance of claim 14 are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel and unobvious elements of claim 14. Therefore, the allowance of claims 15-18 is respectfully requested.

4.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-18.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Date: March 12, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com